DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 358 HE 018 387

TITLE	Remedial Education in Maryland's Public Higher Education Institutions. Postsecondary Education Research Reports.
INSTITUTION	Maryland State Board for Higher Education, Annapolis.
PUB DATE	Apr 85
NOTE	69p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Maryland State Board for Higher Education, 16 Francis Street, Annapolis, MD 21401.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Accountability; *Basic Skills; *Community Colleges; *Developmental Studies Programs; Educational Policy; Educational Testing; Followup Studies; Higher Education; *High Risk Students; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Remedial Programs; Screening Tests; State Colleges; State Surveys; Student Placement
IDENTIFIERS	*Maryland; *Public Colleges

ABSTRACT

Results of a study of remedial education at all Maryland public colleges and universities, except for three campuses, are presented. Findings include: (1) by fall 1985 all institutions will have in place a systematic screening process to identify students lacking in one or more basic skill areas; (2) while all campuses collect some evaluative data on remedial programs, only the Board of Trustees of State Universities and Colleges (BTSUC) and five community colleges conduct systematic followup studies of the academic success of underprepared students who have completed remedial programs; (3) BTSUC is the only segment with a comprehensive and clearly defined remedial education delivery system that includes testing, placement, a structured set of courses, and a time limit to complete the required courses and evaluation; (4) 90 percent of all remedial education enrollments were reported for the community colleges; (5) statewide, 37 percent of all incoming students were estimated to be underprepared; (6) 43 percent of community college entrants were reported to be underprepared; and (7) statewide, verbal skills remedial education programs accounted for 40 percent of all enrollments, while basic math skills programs accounted for 27 percent. Survey instruments are appended, along with school policies concerning student testing and placement and remedial program evaluation. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257358

REMEDIAL EDUCATION IN MARYLAND'S PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION RESEARCH REPORTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Maryland State Board for H.E.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

STATE BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
9 Francis St.
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(301) 269-2937

REMEDIAL EDUCATION IN MARYLAND'S PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

State Board for Higher Education
16 Francis Street
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
April 1985

State of Maryland

STATE BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Thomas H. Maddux, Chairman

J. Harrison Ager, Vice Chairman

Gertrude H. Crist, Secretary

Dr. Thelma B. Cox

Bernard T. Devaney

Dr. Anne Osborn Emery

Lucy Keker

Richard R. Kline

Kim McFann

Hon. Mary L. Nock

Philip Pear

Harry B. Smith

Dr. Sheldon H. Knorr
Commissioner of Higher Education

The Maryland State Board for Higher Education is an
Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of a study of remedial education requested by the Education Coordinating Committee. Data were gathered from all Maryland public higher education institutions except UMAB, UMUC and the University of Baltimore. The following are highlights of the results.

- By Fall 1985 all institutions of higher education will have in place a systematic screening process to identify students lacking in one or more basic skill areas. This pattern is in sharp contrast with the institutional policies reported in the 1978 SBHE study, which revealed the absence in most institutions of systematic screening of incoming freshmen.

- While all campuses collect some evaluative data on remedial programs, only the BTSUC and five community colleges conduct systematic follow-up studies of the subsequent academic success of the underprepared students who have completed remedial programs.

- The BTSUC is the only segment with a comprehensive and clearly defined remedial education delivery system which includes testing, placement, a structured set of courses, and a time limit to complete the required courses and evaluation.

- Ninety percent of all enrollments in remedial education activities were reported by the community colleges, 4.3% by the BTSUC institutions, 2.6% by Morgan, 2.2% by the campuses of the University of Maryland and 0.2% by St. Mary's .

- Statewide, 37% of all incoming students were estimated to be underprepared. However there were major differences by segment: 43% of community colleges' entrants were reported to be underprepared; 6%, at the University of Maryland's campuses; 37%, at the BTSUC colleges; 70%, at Morgan; and 16% at St. Mary's.

- Statewide verbal skills (reading and writing) remedial education programs accounted for 40% of all enrollments, while basic math skills programs accounted for 27%. This pattern was different at the University of Maryland campuses, in which 67% of the remedial enrollments were reported in math programs.

- In FY 1984 the institutions spent $7.3 million for remedial education, $5.8 or 79% at the community colleges and $1.5 or 21% at 4-year institutions.

- Between FY 1978 and FY 1984 overall expenditures for remedial education have increased by $1.7 million statewide. However the increase has occurred at the community colleges. Overall expenditures at 4-year institutions decreased by $.9 million between FY 1978 and FY 1984. When adjusted for inflation, however, overall expenditures for remedial education have decreased by about 20 percent since FY 1978.

- While total dollars increased at community colleges, expenditures for remedial education remained about the same proportion of Total Educational and General Expenditures between FY 1978 (2.7%) and FY 1984 (2.6%). Expenditures for remedial education at 4-year institutions declined as a proportion of Total Educational and General Expenditures from FY 1978 (0.9%) to FY 1984 (0.3%). The statewide expenditures declined from 1.5% to 1.1%.

- The federal share of total expenditures for remedial education was 5% ($.4 million) in FY 1984. This represented a decrease from the FY 1978 level, 18% or $1 million. All segments were affected by this decrease except the University of Maryland campuses, which actually increased the total federal dollars and the federal share of total expenditures for remedial education (from 27% in FY 1978 to 44% in FY 1984).

INTRODUCTION

The Education Coordinating Committee requested that the State Board for Higher Education undertake a study of remedial education in Maryland's public institutions of higher education (IHE). The Faculty Advisory Committee to the SBHE and the Maryland General Assembly also expressed interest in this issue. This report summarizes the results of this study.

Background

In its Statewide Plan for Postsecondary Education, the State Board for Higher Education has affirmed "access" to postsecondary education for all citizens as one of the primary goals of higher education in Maryland. Among the obstacles to access is a lack of adequate academic preparation. Through remedial programs, but within the limitations of institutional roles and missions, Maryland's public system of higher education has provided opportunities for all who demonstrate the potential to benefit from college level instruction.

Purposes

The following policy questions were identified as relevant to the study:

- What remedial education programs, courses and activities have been implemented by the State's IHE's?
- What are the general institutional policies and practices regarding the identification and placement of underprepared students?
- How many students entering the State's IHE's are in need of remedial education?
- What is the cost of remedial education in Maryland's IHE?
- What evaluative data are collected on remedial programs?

Methodology

An Advisory Task Force of segmental representatives was appointed to assist the SBHE staff in this study. Appendix A lists the members of the Task Force. A survey instrument was developed for data collection purposes. Two versions of this

instrument were used: one for community colleges and another one for four-year institutions. The main difference between the two was the addition of a special page in the community colleges form requesting data on continuing education remedial programs. A copy of the survey instrument and the instructions are included in Appendix B. Data were requested for Fiscal Year 1984 (budget data) and for the corresponding 1983-1984 academic year (enrollments,policies and type of activities).

The first section of the survey instrument requested information on general institutional policies and practices concerning identification and placement of underprepared students and institutional evaluation of remedial programs. In the second section institutions were requested to list the educational activities which could be considered remedial within the parameters of the definition used. For each activity so identified the following set of data were requested: skill area addressed by the activity, students served by the activity, type of activity, direct cost of the activity and revenue source (federal or state/local/tuition). The unit of analysis of the study was then the remedial activity itself, not the student. The use of activity as the unit of analysis necessary to gather data on expenditures, imposed some limitations in the study. Finally, in the third section of the survey institutions were requested to estimate the number of underprepared entering first year students.

Definition

The following definition of remedial education was used in this study:

> "Remedial education refers to programs, courses and activities designed specifically for entering students who lack minimum reading, written or oral communication, mathematical, or study skills, and/or other basic skills necessary to do freshman level college work as defined by the institution".

As the emphasis in the definition was in "freshman level work", the University of Baltimore and the Baltimore City and University College campuses of the University of Maryland (which either do not admit freshmen or enroll a small number), were not included in the study.

Limitations

As was mentioned before, the unit of analysis used in this report was the remedial activity itself, not the student. Therefore data on enrollment in remedial education activities are not unduplicated; i.e., a student enrolled in remedial writing and math courses was counted twice, once in the writing course and another time in the math course.

Whenever appropriate and possible, comparisons with results from a study on remedial education previously conducted by the SBHE (using FY78 data) are included in this report. Some caution is necessary, however, as the 1978 study used a similar but not identical definition of remedial education. Further, the 1978 study did not attempt to collect data on continuing education remedial programs in community colleges. For this report these data (continuing education) have been analyzed separately, and the results are presented in a separate section.

As the definition used is campus-based ("...basic skills necessary to do freshman level college work as defined by the institution"), inter-institutional comparisons should be interpreted with caution.

Finally, it should be noted that all data and information are reported as provided by the institutions themselves.

REMEDIAL EDUCATION: INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES AND PRACTICES

The first section of the survey instrument asked each institution to describe briefly the policies and practices regarding remedial education: identification and placement of underprepared students, exit criteria, and evaluation of remedial education programs. This section summarizes the institutional reponses. Appendix C includes a detailed description of each institution's policies and practices.

Identification and Placement of Underprepared Students

Table 1 is a summary of the institutional practices regarding the identification and placement of underprepared students. All institutions but Essex Community College reported having in place a systematic screening process to identify students lacking in one or more basic skill areas. Next Fall however Essex will implement such a screening process. Four community colleges, Morgan and UMES test all incoming freshmen. Eight community colleges test all degree seeking entering students. Four community colleges, St. Mary's, UMBC, UMCP and all five BTSUC institutions test only those freshmen whose high school record and/or SAT scores fall below specified levels. This pattern is in sharp contrast with the institutional policies reported in the 1978 study, which revealed the absence in most institutions of systematic screening of incoming freshmen.

Additionally six community colleges and UMES reported that underprepared students are further identified and referred to remedial programs by faculty members. Six community colleges and three 4-year institutions also reported self-identification and referral by students themselves.

Table 1 also shows that institutions place students identified as underprepared by the use of cut-off scores from placement test and/or high school record and SAT/ACT scores. The placement method used (placement test scores or SAT/ACT) generally corresponds to the system used to identify underprepared students.

In four community colleges (Catonsville, Frederick, Garrett and Montgomery) some underprepared students are required to enroll in remedial courses only; all other institutions allow all underprepared students to enroll concurrently in remedial and regular credit courses.

Criteria to Exit Remedial Education Programs and Courses

As shown in Table 2, all institutions require students identified as underprepared to complete the basic skill course or program into which they were placed. Three community colleges (Charles, Hagerstown and Harford) and all BTSUC intitutions further require the students to pass a competency test. The BTSUC institutions also set a time limit of three terms (one academic year and one summer) for the underprepared students to complete the required remedial courses and to pass the competency exam(s).

Institutional Evaluation of Remedial Education

Table 3 summarizes the information provided by the institutions regarding evaluation of remedial education. All institutions collect some evaluative data on remedial programs and courses. Follow-up studies of the subsequent academic success of the underprepared students who have completed remedial programs (perhaps the evaluative measure with the highest degree of credibility) are systematically conducted only by five community colleges (Allegany, Chesapeake,Hagerstown, Harford and Prince George's) and the BTSUC institutions. Additionally, eight community colleges reported that they conduct periodic studies on the effectiveness of remedial programs and courses; these periodic studies tend to include follow-up of the students who have completed remedial programs.

While the information on evaluation collected in 1978 is not directly comparable to the information requested in this study, generally there seems to be an increase in the emphasis on follow-up studies of subsequent academic success of students who have completed remedial programs.

Many institutions provided the SBHE with copies of evaluation reports. Most however were studies of processes and not of outcomes. Allegany, Chesapeake, Harford and Prince George's community colleges submitted reports which included data on the subsequent academic success of students who had completed remedial programs.

A study of grade distribution in freshman English at Allegany shows that former remedial students had approximately the same grade distribution in English 101 as did students not required to take remedial English. The same was true in freshman math. A study by Chesapeake Community College found that former remedial students had maintained a

C average in subsequent credit courses. A Harford Community College study found that 54% of former remedial students passed freshman English. This study also indicated that students who took and passed remedial writing persisted at the college at a higher rate than the general student population. A 1981 study at Prince George's Community College found that 84% of students who had taken developmental English passed freshman English with a C or better grade. Also, the PGCC study found that former remedial students eventually completed just as many college-level English courses as other students.

REMEDIAL EDUCATION: ENROLLMENTS AND EXPENDITURES

This section includes enrollment and cost data on remedial education activities (for FY 84 and academic year 1983-1984), excluding those which were reported by the institutions to be part of their continuing education programs. Continuing education remedial programs are the focus of the next section of this report. Enrollment data are not unduplicated counts, given the limitations cited in the Introduction. However this section does include data on the unduplicated count of underprepared entering first year students estimated by the institutions. This information is addressed at the end of the section.

Total Enrollments and Expenditures

The State public higher education institutions reported a total of 64,035 (duplicated) enrollments in all remedial activities (see Table 4). Ninety percent of these enrollments were reported by the community colleges, and 10% by the four-year institutions (4.3% by the BTSUC institutions, 2.6% by Morgan State, 0.5% by St. Mary's and 2.2% by the three campuses of the University of Maryland included in this study*).

Table 5 shows the amount expended by each institution to support remedial education activities. Statewide, the institutions spent $7.3 million for remedial education activities: $5.8 million or 79% at the community Colleges and $1.5 million or 21% at the public 4-year institutions: $.7 million (10%) at the BTSUC institutions, $.3 million (3.6%) at Morgan, $.5 million (7%) at the Univerity of Maryland and $15,000 (0.2%) at St. Mary's. These expenditure patterns are consistent with the remedial education enrollment patterns: the vast majority of expenditures are at the community colleges, which reported the greatest number of enrollments.

Table 5 also shows total expenditures for each institution reported on the HEGIS Financial Statistics report (HEGIS Form 2400-4) and the percent of total expenditures used for remedial education. This analysis also indicates the greater commitment of resources to remediation at community colleges (2.6%) compared to 4-year institutions (0.3%).

---

*All data for the University of Maryland include UMCP's Intensive Educational Development (IED) program, which is classified by the campus as a developmental rather than a remedial program.

Table 6 shows the federal share of total expenditures for remedial education. Statewide, 5% of all expenditures ($.4 million) were reported to be federal monies. However there were major differences by segment: federal support was 44% at the University of Maryland campuses (at UMES it was 80%); 1% at the BTSUC institutions (only Bowie reported federal support); and 2.5% at the community colleges (only Anne Arundel, CCB, Dundalk, Garrett, Hagerstown and Howard reported any federal support). Morgan and St. Mary's did not report any federal support.

Table 7 shows expenditures for remedial education and federal dollars by segment for FY 1978 and FY 1984. Table 8 shows remedial expenditures as a percent of total expenditures and federal support as a percent of remedial expenditures for the two years. While caution should be exercised in making comparisons between the two reports because of differences in the definitions used in the two surveys, Tables 7 and 8 provide a reasonable basis for comparing overall expenditure levels for remedial education in FY 1978 and FY 1984. Between FY 1978 and FY 1984 overall expenditures for remedial education have increased by $1.7 million statewide. However, the increase has occurred at the community colleges. Overall expenditures at 4-year institutions decreased between FY 1978 and FY 1984. While total dollars increased at community colleges, expenditures for remedial education remained about the same proportion of total expenditures between FY 1978 (2.7 percent) and FY 1984 (2.6 percent). Expenditures for remedial education at 4-year institutions and for the state as a whole declined as a proportion of total expenditures. Four-year institutions declined from 0.9% to 0.3%; statewide the decline was from 1.5% to 1.1%.

Another significant difference in financing patterns between FY 1978 and FY 1984 is the decline in federal funds to support remedial education. In FY 1978, institutions reported more than $1.0 million in federal funds supporting remedial education (or 18% of total expenditures). By FY 1984 the federal support had declined to $.4 million (or 5.3% of total expenditures). However the impact of this decline in federal support was not uniform throughout the segments. The community colleges reported $293,677 in federal funds for FY 1978 (or 9% of total expenditures for remedial education; for FY 1984 they reported only $145,572 (or 2.5%). Morgan, which had received $20,799 in federal support in FY 1978 (or 9%), did not report any for FY 1984. The University of Maryland campuses on the other hand reported an increase in federal support for remedial education: from $196,368 in FY 1978 to $230,234 in FY 1984. The proportion of expenditures accounted for by federal monies also rose during this period from 27% to 44%.

Enrollments and Expenditures by Skill Area

Enrollments and expenditures in remedial education activities were analyzed by the basic skill area addressed by the activities: reading, writing/ oral communication, mathematics, and study skills. Some remedial activities reported by the institutions focused on other areas such as English as a second language or preparation for GED. The focus of some other remedial programs was reported to be more than one single skill; typically these activities addressed reading and writing, although some comprehensive programs included mathematics as well. Finally, activities which were reported to focus on "English" were combined for this report with those activities with a written/oral communication focus.

Table 9 displays data by segment on the distribution of the (duplicated) enrollments in remedial education activities by the basic skill area addressed. Statewide, verbal skills programs (reading and writing) accounted for 40% of all enrollments, while math accounted for 27%. Given the community colleges' share of total enrollments, it is not surprising that the statewide distribution reflects the community colleges'. This emphasis on verbal skills was more pronounced at the BTSUC institutions (81% of enrollments), Morgan (61%) and St. Mary's (42%). The pattern at the University of Maryland however was different: 67% of the enrollments in remedial education in the University campuses were in mathematics programs..

Table 10 shows expenditures by skill area for each segment. Statewide, 56% of the total was expended for reading and writing/verbal communication programs, 26% for math, and the remaining 18% for multiple skills programs, study skills and other. As would be expected, expenditure patterns at community colleges closely parallel the statewide average. There is considerably more variation by segment at the four-year institutions. The BTSUC institutions spend 83% of their funds in verbal skills, 17% for mathematics and none in the other areas. The University of Maryland has 82% of its remedial resources in programs addressing multiple skill areas, 16% in Math, 2% in writing and verbal communications and nothing in the other areas. Morgan invests more than half of its remedial dollars in math programs and the remainder in vebal skills (49%). St. Mary's spends less than $15,000 for remedial programs and more than two-thirds are for writing and verbal communication programs.

Expenditure patterns by skill area do not necessarily correspond with enrollment patterns. Expenditures for reading, writing and verbal communications are a higher proportion of the total expenditures than enrollments in these areas are of total enrollments. Math is about the same, and expenditures for programs addressing multiple skills are a lower proportion of the total than enrollments. By segment, BTSUC expenditure patterns most closely parallel enrollment patterns, followed by Community Colleges. The greatest disparity between enrollment patterns and expenditure patterns is at the University of Maryland. These patterns suggest that it may be somewhat more expensive to provide remediation in the areas of reading, writing and verbal communications, but even that pattern is not consistent across all segments.

Enrollments and Expenditures by Type of Activity

The institutions were requested to classify each remedial activity into one of the following categories: comprehensive program, course, skill lab, and other. Definitions were provided with the instructions to complete the survey instrument (see Appendix B).

Table 11 shows the (duplicated) enrollments in remedial education activities broken down by segment and type of activity. Statewide 43% of the enrollments were in courses, 29% in comprehensive programs, 9% in skill labs and 19% in other type of activities. Again the community colleges pattern closely reflects the statewide distribution. However the pattern for four-year institutions was very different. At the BTSUC institutions all remedial education is delivered through comprehensive programs. At the University of Maryland 80% of the remedial enrollments were in courses and 20% in comprehensive programs. All of Morgan's remedial enrollments were in courses. Finally at St. Mary's 45% of the enrollments were in courses, 13% in skill labs and 43% in other type of activities.

Expenditures by type of activity (see Table 12) were about evenly split between comprehensive programs and courses, with only about 8 percent for skill labs and other activities statewide. However, there was considerable variation among segments. BTSUC and the University of Maryland expended most of their remedial dollars in comprehensive programs, Morgan used only courses, and St. Mary's and community colleges spent slightly more than half for courses with the remainder distributed across other activities. Only the community college segment expends funds in all activity areas.

Expenditure patterns do not follow enrollment patterns by type of activity: the proportion of expenditures for comprehensive programs (46%) exceeds these programs' share of enrollments (29%). This seems to indicate that comprehensive programs are the most expensive delivery system for remedial education. However, they are perceived by some educators to be more effective. This study did not attempt to address the question of which system is best suited to deliver remedial education.

Number of Underprepared Entering First Year Students

Institutions were requested to estimate the number of unduplicated underprepared entering first year students. While the students so defined are not exclusively recent high school seniors, most of them can be assumed to be. This information may serve as base line data to assess future trends in the academic preparation of high school seniors and the impact of the programs implemented by the State Department of Education (like Program Basic).

Table 13 shows the number of underprepared entering first year students by segment as reported by the institutions for academic year 1983-1984. Statewide 19,238 underprepared students were reported. Eighty-six percent of them were reported by the community colleges, 2% by the University of Maryland, 9% by the BTSUC institutions, 4% by Morgan and less than 0.5% by St. Mary's. These results reflect the patterns of expenditures and enrollments previously analyzed.

Table 13 also shows the estimated percentage underprepared students were of all incoming students. Statewide, 37% of all incoming students were estimated to be underprepared. However there were major differences by segment: 43% of community colleges' entrants were reported to be underprepared; 6%, at the University of Maryland's campuses; 37%, at the BTSUC colleges; 70%, at Morgan; and 16% at St. Mary's.

CONTINUING EDUCATION REMEDIAL PROGRAMS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

This section summarizes the enrollment and expenditure data of remedial education activities reported by the community colleges to be part of their continuing education programs.

Enrollments

Table 14 shows data on (duplicated) enrollments on continuing education remedial programs. Programs which focus on multiple, math and other skills accounted for the largest shares of the enrollments (45%, 20% and 21% respectively), while reading and writing programs were 6% and 7% of the enrollments. This pattern is opposite of the remedial enrollments which were not part of the community colleges' continuing education efforts, in which writing and reading skills programs accounted for 39% of all remedial enrollments.

Table 15 shows remedial enrollment data broken down by type of activity. Twenty-one percent of the total enrollments were reported in comprehensive programs, 25% in courses, 10% in skill labs and 43% in other types of activities. Remedial enrollments reported by community colleges in non-continuing education programs relied more heavily on courses (43%).

Expenditures

In FY 1984 community colleges spent $756,525 for continuing education remedial programs (Table 16). Federal funds provided only 7% of total funds. Table 17 shows expenditures by skill area. The majority of funds are expended in multiple skills (33.8%) and other programs (36.4%). About 16% of the funds were expended for reading, written and verbal communications programs and 13.5% for math. These expenditure patterns parallel the enrollment patterns in this area.

Table 18 shows expenditures by type of activity. The expenditures are about evenly divided between comprehensive programs (35,6%) and courses (35.3%) with the remaining 29% in other and skill labs. Again expenditures patterns are similar to enrollment patterns for these programs.

TABLES

TABLE 1

Identification and Placement of Underprepared Students

	Identification						Placement	
	Mandatory testing of all entering students	Mandatory testing of all entering degree-seeking students	Mandatory testing of some students based on H.S. Record and/or SAT/ACT	Faculty referral	Self-referral		Placement by cut-off scores on placement test	Placement by review of H.S. record and/or SAT/ACT
COMMUNITY COLLEGES								
Allegany		x		x	x		x	
Anne Arundel			x	x			x	
Catonsville		x		x	x		x	x
Cecil	x						x	
Charles		x					x	
Chesapeake	x			x	x		x	
Com. College of Baltimore		x					x	
Dundalk	x				x		x	
Essex*	x			x	x			
Frederick			x	x			x	x
Garrett	x						x	
Hagerstown Jr. College			x				x	
Harford		x					x	x
Howard		x					x	x
Montgomery			x				x	
Prince George's		x			x		x	
Wor-Wic Tech		x					x	
COMMUNITY COLLEGE TOTAL	5	8	4	6	6		16	4
FOUR YEAR INSTITUTIONS								
Bowie State College			x				x	
Coppin State College			x				x	
Frostburg State College			x				x	
Salisbury State College			x				x	
Towson State University			x				x	
Morgan	x						x	
St. Mary's			x		x			x
UMBC			x				x	x
UMCP			x		x			x
UMES	x			x			x	x
FOUR YEAR INSTITUTION TOTAL	2	0	8	1	3		8	4

* As of Fall 1985

TABLE 2

Requirements for Exit from Remedial Programs

	Students must pass competency test(s)	Students must complete basic skill course	
COMMUNITY COLLEGES			
Allegany		x	
Anne Arundel		x	
Catonsville		x	
Cecil		x	
Charles	x	x	
Chesapeake		x	
Com. College of Baltimore		x	
Dundalk		x	
Essex		x	
Frederick		x	
Garrett		x	
Hagerstown Jr. College	x	x	
Harford	x	x	
Howard		x	
Montgomery		x	
Prince George's		x	
Wor-Wic Tech		x	
COMMUNITY COLLEGE TOTAL	3	17	
FOUR YEAR INSTITUTIONS			
Bowie State College	x	x	
Coppin State College	x	x	
Frostburg State College	x	x	
Salisbury State College	x	x	
Towson State University	x	x	
Morgan	x	x	
St. Mary's		x	
UMBC		x	
UMCP		x	
UMES		x	
FOUR YEAR INSTITUTION TOTAL	6	10	

TABLE 3

Evaluation Procedures of Remedial Education Program

	Student evaluations of remedial courses/activities	Instructor evaluations of success of remedial activities	Rate of successful completion of remedial activity	Follow-up studies of academic success of students completing remedial activities	Faculty surveys (includes all faculty, not just instructors in remedial courses)	Periodic studies of effectiveness of courses on programs (not on regular schedule)
COMMUNITY COLLEGES						
Allegany	x	x		x	x	
Anne Arundel	x				x	x
Catonsville						x
Cecil	x				x	x
Charles		x				x
Chesapeake				x		
Com. College of Baltimore	x	x	x			x
Dundalk	x	x				x
Essex						x
Frederick		x				
Garrett	x	x	x			
Hagerstown Jr. College				x		x
Harford				x		x
Howard	x	x	x			
Montgomery			x			x
Prince George's	x		x	x		
Wor-Wic Tech			x			
COMMUNITY COLLEGE TOTAL	8	7	6	5	3	10
FOUR YEAR INSTITUTIONS						
Bowie State College			x	x		
Coppin State College			x	x		
Frostburg State College			x	x		
Salisbury State College			x	x		
Towson State University			x	x		
Morgan			x			
St. Mary's			x			
UMBC			x			
UMCP			x			
UMES		x				
FOUR YEAR INSTITUTION TOTAL	0	1	9	5	0	0

TABLE 4

TOTAL REMEDIAL ENROLLMENTS* BY SEGMENT
(Excluding Continuing Education)

	N	%
Community Colleges	57,870	90.4%
BTSUC	2,727	4.3%
Morgan	1,664	2.6%
St. Mary's	352	0.5%
University of Maryland	1,422	2.2%
TOTAL	64,035	100.0%

* These are NOT unduplicated enrollments - neither within nor across skill area.

TABLE 5

TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR REMEDIAL EDUCATION
FY 1984

	Total Remedial Expenditures	Total Current Expenditures*	% of Total Current Expenditures
University of Maryland			
College Park	$ 293,629**	$255,526,966	0.1%
Baltimore County	48,600	39,012,652	0.1
Eastern Shore	184,993	13,173,675	1.4
Total UM	$ 527,222	$307,713,293	0.2%
Board of Trustees of the State Universities and Colleges			
Bowie State College	$ 137,680	$ 11,655,619	1.2%
Coppin State College	196,100	14,124,507	1.4
Frostburg State College	116,460	17,910,302	0.7
Salisbury State College	143,000	16,649,356	0.9
Towson State University	133,180	47,401,977	0.3
Total BTSUC	$ 726,420	$107,741,761	0.7%
Morgan State University	$ 263,749	$ 28,087,232	0.9%
St. Mary's College of Maryland	$ 14,969	$ 6,712,815	0.2%
Total 4-Year	$1,532,360	$450,255,101	0.3%
Community Colleges			
Allegany	$ 134,291	$ 7,451,888	1.8%
Anne Arundel	379,559	15,529,475	2.4
Catonsville	285,793	25,169,921	1.1
Cecil	185,254	3,810,931	4.9
Charles	61,561	8,273,953	0.7
Chesapeake	53,849	4,642,888	1.2
Community College of Baltimore	1,906,761	24,222,233	7.9
Dundalk	387,684	8,615,089	4.5
Essex	312,600	21,363,784	1.5
Frederick	98,836	5,558,173	1.8
Garrett	48,584	2,165,155	2.2
Hagerstown	108,907	5,181,096	2.1
Harford	130,455	10,514,879	1.2
Howard	81,613	7,302,385	1.1
Montgomery	1,105,248	46,339,315	2.4
Prince George's	435,000	26,450,208	1.6
Wor-Wic Tech	49,251	2,479,834	2.0
Total CC	$5,765,246	$225,071,207	2.6%
Total State	$7,297,606	$675,326,308	1.1%

* Total Educational and General Expenditures and Mandatory Transfer (HEGIS Form 2400 - 4 p. 2, Part B, Line 12)

**Includes IED expenditures which, is considered by the campus to be a developmental rather than a remedial program.

TABLE 6

FEDERAL FUND SUPPORT OF
TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR REMEDIAL EDUCATION
FY 1984

	Total Remedial Expenditures	Federal Funds	Percent Federal Funds
University of Maryland			
College Park	$ 293,629*	$ 81,150*	27.6
Baltimore County	48,600	0	0.0
Eastern Shore	184,993	149,084	80.6
Total UM	$ 527,222	$230,234	43.7
Board of Trustees of the State Universities and Colleges			
Bowie State College	$ 137,680	$ 10,051	7.3
Coppin State College	196,100	0	0.0
Frostburg State College	116,460	0	0.0
Salisbury State College	143,000	0	0.0
Towson State University	133,180	0	0.0
Total BTSUC	$ 726,420	$ 10,051	1.4
Morgan State University	$ 263,749	$ 0	0.0
St. Mary's College of Maryland	$ 14,969	0	0.0
Total 4-Year	$1,532,360	$240,285	15.7
Community Colleges			
Allegany	$ 134,291	$ 0	0.0
Anne Arundel	379,559	8,800	2.3
Catonsville	285,793	0	0.0
Cecil	185,254	0	0.0
Charles	61,561	0	0.0
Chesapeake	53,849	0	0.0
Community College of Baltimore	1,906,761	63,938**	3.4
Dundalk	387,684	51,488	13.3
Essex	312,600	0	0.0
Frederick	98,836	0	0.0
Garrett	48,584	1,696	3.5
Hagerstown	108,907	13,500	12.4
Harford	130,455	0	0.0
Howard	81,613	6,150	7.5
Montgomery	1,105,248	0	0.0
Prince George's	435,000	0	0.0
Wor-Wic Tech	49,251	0	0.0
Total CC	$5,765,246	$145,572	2.5
Total State	$7,297,606	$385,857	5.3

* Includes IED expenditures, which is considered by the campus to be a developmental rather than a remedial program.
**Estimated

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF EXPENDITURES FOR REMEDIAL EDUCATION BY SEGMENT
FY 1978 and FY 1984

	Total Expenditures for Remedial Education		Federal Funds for Remedial Education	
	FY 1978	FY 1984	FY 1978	FY 1984
University of Maryland*	$ 721,029	$ 527,629	$ 196,368	$230,038
Board of Trustees of the State Univ. and Colleges	1,419,366	726,420	490,012	9,638
Morgan State University	226,982	263,749	20,799	0
St. Mary's College of Maryland	19,860	14,969	0	0
Total 4 Year	2,387,237	1,532,360	707,179	239,676
Community Colleges	3,162,086	5,765,246	293,677	145,572
Total Statewide	$5,549,323	$7,297,606	$1,000,856	$385,248

*Both FY 78 and FY 84 include IED data, which UMCP does not classify as remedial, but rather developmental.

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF EXPENDITURE PATTERNS FOR
REMEDIAL EDUCATION
FY 1978 AND FY 1984

	Remedial Expenditures as a Percenage of Total Expenditures		Federal Funds as a Percentage of Remedial Expenditures	
	FY 1978	FY 1984	FY 1978	FY 1984
University of Maryland *	0.4%	N/A	27.2%	43.6%
Board of Trustees of State Univ. & Colleges	2.1%	N/A	34.5%	1.3%
Morgan State University	1.2%	0.9%	9.2%	0.0
St. Mary's College of Maryland	0.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0
Total Four Year	0.9%	N/A	30.0%	15.6%
Community Colleges	2.7%	2.6%	9.3%	2.5%
Total Statewide	1.5%	N/A	18.0%	5.3%

*Both FY 78 and FY 84 include IED data, which UMCP does not classify as remedial, but rather developmental.

TABLE 9

TOTAL ENROLLMENTS* BY SKILL AREA BY SEGMENT
(EXCLUDING CONTINUING EDUCATION)

	Comm. Col.		UM		BTSUC		Morgan		St. Mary's		All Inst.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Reading	9896	17%	-	-	1069	39%	599	36%	22	6%	11586	18%
Writing/Verbal Com	12572	22%	126	9%	1158	42%	409	25%	127	36%	14392	22%
Mathematics	15398	27%	951	67%	500	18%	656	39%	-	-	17505	27%
Study Skills	1618	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	53	15%	1671	3%
Other	4559	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4559	8%
Multiple Skills	13827	24%	345	24%	-	-	-	-	150	43%	14322	22%
Total	57870	100%	1422	100%	2727	100%	1664	100%	352	100%	64035	100%

*These are NOT unduplicated enrollments - neither within nor across skill area.

Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding error

TABLE 10

TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY SKILL AREA BY SEGMENT
(Excluding Continuing Education)

FY 1984

	Comm. Col.		U of Md.*		BTSUC		Morgan		St. Mary's		All Inst.	
Reading	$1,473,218	26%	$ 0	-	$293,029	40%	$ 29,471	11%	$ 1,038	7%	$1,796,756	25%
Writing Verbal Comm.	1,841,168	32%	9,600	2%	309,862	43%	100,256	38%	10,191	68%	2,271,077	31%
Math	1,589,019	28%	84,625	16%	123,529	17%	134,022	51%	0	0	1,931,195	26%
Study Skills	143,535	2%	0		0	-	0	-	2,076	14%	145,611	2%
Other	208,533	4%	0		0	-	0	-	0	-	209,533	3%
Multiple Skills	508,773	9%	432,997	82%	0	-	0	-	1,664	11%	943,434	13%
Total	$5,765,246	100%	527,222	100%	$726,420	100%	$263,749	100%	$14,969	100%	$7,297,606	100%

Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding error.

*Includes IED expenditures, which is considered by the campus to be a developmental rather than a remedial program.

TABLE 11

TOTAL ENROLLMENTS* BY TYPE OF ACTIVITY BY SEGMENT
(Excluding Continuing Education)

	Comm. Col.		UM		BTSUC		Morgan		St. Mary's		All Inst.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Comprehensive Prog.	15308	26%	290	20%	2727	100%	-	-	-	-	18325	29%
Courses	24891	43%	1132	80%	-	-	1664	100%	158	45%	27845	43%
Skill Labs	5560	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	13%	5604	9%
Other	12111	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	150	43%	12261	19%
Total	57870	100%	1422	100%	2727	100%	1664	100%	352	100%	64035	100%

*These are NOT unduplicated enrollments - Neither within nor across type of activity

Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding error

TABLE 12

TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY TYPE OF ACTIVITY BY SEGMENT
(Excluding Continuing Education)

FY 1984

	Comm. Col.		U of Md.*		BTSUC		Morgan		St. Mary's		All Inst.	
Comprehensive Program	$2,231,297	39%	$427,897	81%	$726,420	100%	$ 0	-	$ 0	-	$3,385,524	46%
Course	2,978,717	52%	99,325	19%	-	-	263,749	100%	8,302	56%	3,350,093	46%
Skill Lab	337,125	6%	0	-	0	-	0	-	5,003	33%	342,128	5%
Other	218,197	4%	0	-	0	-	0	-	1,664	11%	219,861	3%
Total	$5,765,246	100%	$527,222	100%	$726,420	100%	$263,749	100%	$14,969	100%	$7,297,606	100%

Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding error.

*Includes IED expenditures, which is considered by the campus to be a developmental rather than a remedial program.

TABLE 13

NUMBER OF UNDERPREPARED ENTERING FIRST YEAR STUDENTS

1983-1984 Academic Year

	Underprepared Entering Students		Full & Part Time Entering Students*	% Freshmen Who are Underprep.
	N	(%)	N	
Community Colleges	16,456	(86%)	38,699	43%
University of Maryland	434	(2%)	6,757	6%
Board of Trustees of the State Universities and Colleges	1,674	(9%)	4,551	37%
Morgan State University	715	(4%)	1,017	70%
St. Mary's College of Maryland	49	**	301	16%
All State	19,238	(100%)	51,325	37%

* Data for four-year institutions include Fall 1983 and Spring 1984 data; for community colleges the data include actual Fall 1983 enrollment and Spring and Summer 1984 estimates provided by the State Board for Community Colleges.

**Less than 0.5%

TABLE 14

ENROLLMENTS* IN CONTINUING EDUCATION
REMEDIAL PROGRAMS BY SKILL AREA

	Community Colleges N	%
Reading	819	6%
Writing/Verbal Comm.	1042	7%
Math	2993	20%
Study Skills	96	1%
Other	3159	21%
Multiple Skills	6763	45%
TOTAL	14872	100%

* These are NOT unduplicated enrollments - neither within nor across skill area. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding error.

TABLE 15

ENROLLMENTS* IN CONTINUING EDUCATION
REMEDIAL PROGRAMS BY TYPE OF ACTIVITY

	Community Colleges	
	N	%
Comprehensive Program	3184	21%
Courses	3786	25%
Skill Labs	1544	10%
Other	6358	43%
TOTAL	14872	100%

* These are NOT unduplicated enrollments - neither within nor across type of activity. Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding error.

TABLE 16

EXPENDITURES FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION
REMEDIAL PROGRAMS
AND FEDERAL FUND SUPPORT

1983-84

	Total Expenditures	Federal Expenditures
Community Colleges		
Allegany	$ 1.000	$ -
Anne Arundel	31,505	-
Catonsville	198,984	-
Cecil	54,984	25,041
Charles	426	-
Chesapeake	796	-
Community College of Baltimore	353,750	-
Dundalk	19,756	-
Essex	-	-
Frederick	-	-
Garrett	28,164	4,681
Hagerstown	37,231	15,432
Harford	-	-
Howard	13,500	9,000
Montgomery	2,026	-
Prince George's	14,403	-
Wor-Wic Tech	-	0
Total	$ 756,525	$ 54,154

TABLE 17

EXPENDITURES FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION
REMEDIAL PROGRAMS
BY SKILL AREA

1983-84

	Reading ($)	Written &Verbal ($)	Math ($)	Study Skills ($)	Other Skills* ($)	Multpl Skills ($)	Expenditures ($)
Community Colleges							
Allegany	-	400	600	-	-	-	1,000
Anne Arundel	14,340	9,600	6,540	600	425	-	31,505
Catonsville	32,688	55,842	76,908	-	4,903	28,643	198,984
Cecil	-	-	-	-	-	54,984	54,984
Charles	-	-	426	-	-	-	426
Chesapeake	-	-	-	-	796	-	796
CCB	-	-	-	-	247,756	105,994	353,750
Dundalk	1,368	192	192	-	3,818	14,186	19,756
Essex	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Frederick	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Garrett	-	-	410	-	13,976	13,778	28,164
Hagerstown	683	3,898	1,430	-	2,000	29,220	37,231
Harford	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Howard	-	-	13,500	-	-	-	13,500
Montgomery	258	421	968	379	-	-	2,026
Prince George's	333	2,375	1,365	-	1,330	9,000	14,403
Wor-Wic Tech	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	49,670	72,728	102,339	979	275,004	255,805	756,525
Percent of Total	6.6%	9.6%	13.5%	0.1%	36.4%	33.8%	100%

*English as a Second Language; preparation for GED; etc.

TABLE 18

EXPENDITURES FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION
REMEDIAL PROGRAMS
BY ACTIVITY

1983-84

	Comprehensive Program ($)	Course ($)	Skill Lab ($)	Other ($)	Total Expenditur ($)
Community Colleges					
Allegany	-	1,000	-	-	1,000
Anne Arundel	-	1,505	30,000	-	31,505
Catonsville	-	170,341	-	28,643	198,984
Cecil	-	-	-	54,984	54,984
Charles	-	-	-	426	426
Chesapeake	-	796	-	-	796
CCB	247,756	-	-	105,994	353,750
Dundalk	11,346	8,410	-	-	19,756
Essex	-	-	-	-	-
Frederick	-	-	-	-	-
Garrett	-	28,164	-	-	28,164
Hagerstown	-	37,231	-	-	37,231
Harford	-	-	-	-	-
Howard	10,000	3,500	-	-	13,500
Montgomery	-	2,026	-	-	2,026
Prince George's	-	14,403	-	-	14,403
Wor-Wic Tech	-	-	-	-	-
Total	269,102	267,376	30,000	190,047	756,525
Percent of Total	35.6%	35.3%	4.0%	25.1%	100%

APPENDIX A

ADVISORY TASK FORCE

Dr. George Funaro, Chair
Deputy Commissioner
State Board for Higher Education

Dr. Lewis F. Cockerill
Director of Instructional Services
Board of Trustees of the State
Universities and Colleges
16 Francis Street
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dr. Warren Hayman
Vice President of Student Affairs
Morgan State University
Coldspring Lane and Hillen Road
Baltimore, Maryland 21239

Dr. Walter Hohenstein
Director of Articulation
University of Maryland
Adelphi, Maryland 20783

Dr. Hercules Pinkney
Director of Continuing Education
State Board for Community Colleges
16 Francis Street
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dr. Michael R. Rosenthal
Dean of the College
St. Mary's College of Maryland
St. Mary's City, Maryland 20686

Staff: Javier Miyares
Higher Education Research
State Board for Higher Education

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT AND INSTRUCTIONS

STATE BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

SURVEY OF REMEDIAL EDUCATION

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The State Board for Higher Education is undertaking a study of remedial education in Maryland's public institutions of higher education (IHE). The Education Coordinating Committee* has requested such a study. The Faculty Advisory Committee to the SBHE and the Maryland General Assembly have also expressed their interest in this issue.

The following policy questions have been identified as relevant to this study:

- What remedial education programs, courses and activities have been implemented by the State's IHE's?
- How many students enrolled in IHE's are in need of remedial education?
- What is the cost of remedial education in Maryland's IHE's?
- How effective are remedial education programs?

DEFINITION OF REMEDIAL EDUCATION

> Remedial education, for purposes of this study, refers to programs, courses and activities designed specifically for entering students who lack minimum reading, written or oral communication, mathematical, or study skills, and/or other basic skills necessary to do freshman level college work as defined by the institution.

These students are generally identified in one or more of the following ways: 1) as admission exceptions to regular admission requirements, 2) by the use of placement test, or 3) by referral of faculty or administrators. These programs, courses, and activities may be offered for institutional nondegree credit or no credit, be required or voluntary, be taken prior to (e.g., summer) or concurrently with regular academic work.

---

*The ECC is composed of three members each from the SBHE and the State Board of Education. By statute, it is charged with a liaison function between secondary and postsecondary education in Maryland.

It is important to make a distinction between remedial and developmental education. Remedial activities, as defined above, should be included in this survey. Developmental activities, which allow students already prepared to undertake freshman level college work to strengthen their talents, are not to be included.

INSTRUCTIONS

A survey form is enclosed which you should use to provide the data necessary for this study. This section provides the instructions to complete the survey form. The data and information requested in the form should cover the 1983-1984 academic year (Fall 83, Spring 84 and either Summer 83 or Summer 84 - whichever one better coincides with your fiscal year). The financial data requested should be from FY84.

The survey consists of three questions: general institutional policies and practices; remedial education activities; and number of underprepared students.

QUESTION I: General Institutional Policies and Practices

This question requests a brief description of your institution's general policies and practices related to remedial education as they have an impact on three key areas. If any of these areas is described in a publication, you may simply attach a copy.

QUESTION II: Remedial Education Activities

A. Name of Activity on your Campus. Identify the programs, courses and activities in your institution which fit the definition provided in the previous section. Remedial education programs and activities which have different components (e.g., advising, tutoring, testing, etc.) may be considered one activity for purposes of providing the requested data.

NOTE: Data for programs with non-remedial components (e.g., Learning Center with speed reading course), should be adjusted to exclude the nonremedial components. The number of students reported should include only those using the remedial components. The financial data should be adjusted proportionally.

B. Type of Activity. Please use the following general classification to describe the type of activity:

1- Program with multiple components (including courses)/ comprehensive program
2- Course (not included in 1)
3- Skill Lab (not included in 1)
4- Other activity (not included in 1)

C. Skill Area(s). For each identified program, course and activity indicate the skill area(s) adressed :

1- Reading skills
2- Writing and/or verbal communication skills
3- Mathematical skills
4- Study skills
5- Other basic skill (specify)

D. Number of Students. Indicate the unduplicated number of students who participated in each identified program, course and activity during academic year 83-84. If you can not provide the unduplicated number, please provide an estimate and explain how you arrived at this estimate.

E. Budget Program. Identify the budget program in which this activity is budgeted (e.g., Instruction, Student Services).

F. Total Dollars. Report the total number of dollars associated with the direct cost of providing the remedial activity. If the remedial activity is a part of a multipurpose program (e.g., Learning Center, Skills Lab), report only the pro rata share of the total budget used to support the remedial activity.

It may be necessary to allocate costs to the activity in some cases. For example, if a remedial writing course is taught in the English department the cost should include the direct faculty salary cost to provide the course, plus any supplies, equipment, materials or other costs associated with the course.

G. Revenue Source. Identify the source(s) of revenue to support the activity. Fund sources should be identified as "Federal", "Special Fees" or "Other". A program supported by a "Special Fee" would be all or partially self-supporting. "Other" includes primarily all General Funds and all Special Funds except Special Fees for self-supporting activities. If the activity is supported from more than one source, show the percent associated with each source.

QUESTION III: Number of Underprepared Students

Please, provide the answers to this question based on the unduplicated number of students your institution has identified (during academic 83-84) as underprepared via one or both of the following:

1- Students accepted to your institution as exemption to the regular admission criteria.
2- Students who took a placement or skill test and were identified as underprepared.

If you are not able to provide the requested information on the basis described, please provide your best estimate of the number of underprepared entering students you had during academic 83-84 and explain how you arrived at this estimate.

STATE BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

SURVEY OF REMEDIAL EDUCATION

INSTITUTION/CAMPUS:_____

Person completing this form:_____

Title:_____ Telephone:_____

I. GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Please describe briefly the remedial education policies and practices of your institution with regard to:

A. Identification of Underprepared Students. How do you identify these students? Through testing? If so, which students are tested? All? Those with an SAT below certain level? Which test(s) do you use? Or are these students identified by faculty/counselor referral?

B. Guidelines for Placement of these Students. What guidelines are used for placement of these students? Has your institution designed a sequence or structure of educational experiences underprepared students should follow? If so, please describe.

C. Evaluation Process for Remedial Education Activities. How do you evaluate remedial activities in your institution? Is there an institution-wide evaluation approach or is it activity specific?

(If your institution has completed a recent evaluation of your remedial efforts, please attach a copy of any report produced as a result of the evaluation).

INSTITUTION/CAMPUS: _____

SURVEY OF REMEDIAL EDUCATION (Cont'd)

II. REMEDIAL EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

Please list the remedial education programs, courses, and activities which were offered by your institution during academic year 83-84 (Fall 83, Spring 84, and Summer 83 or Summer 84 - whichever one better coincides with your fiscal year), and provide the information requested for each activity. Enrollment data are requested for academic year 83-84; financial data for FY 84.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
NAME OF ACTIVITY ON YOUR CAMPUS	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	SKILL AREA(S)	N OF STUDENTS	BUDGET PROGRAM	TOTAL DOLLARS	REVENUE SOURCE

III. NUMBER OF UNDERPREPARED STUDENTS

Give the total number of unduplicated underprepared entering first year students enrolled in your campus/institution academic year 83-84.

_____

INSTITUTION/CAMPUS: _____

SURVEY OF REMEDIAL EDUCATION (Cont'd)

II-B. REMEDIAL EDUCATION ACTIVITIES (Conducted by Non-Credit Departments)

Please list the remedial education programs, courses, and activities which were offered by your institution during academic year 83-84 (Fall 83, Spring 84, and Summer 83 or Summer 84 - whichever one better coincides with your fiscal year), and provide the information requested for each activity. Enrollment data are requested for academic year 83-84; financial data for FY 84.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
NAME OF ACTIVITY ON YOUR CAMPUS	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	SKILL AREA(S)	N OF STUDENTS	BUDGET PROGRAM	TOTAL DOLLARS	REVENUE SOURCE

(COMMUNITY COLLEGES ONLY)

52

III-B. NUMBER OF UNDERPREPARED STUDENTS

54

55

Give the total number of unduplicated underprepared entering first year students enrolled in your campus/institution academic year 83-84.

_____

APPENDIX C

INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES AND PRACTICES CONCERNING TESTING AND PLACEMENT OF UNDERPREPARED STUDENTS, AND EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

General Institutional Policies and Practices

The first section of the Survey of Remedial Education asked each institution to describe briefly the remedial education policies and practices in three areas:

1. Identification of students underprepared in basic skill areas.

2. Guidelines for the placement of these students.

3. Evaluation processes for determining the effectiveness of remedial education activities.

The intent was to determine, first, whether institutions had regular procedures for the identification of underprepared students. For example, are entering students tested in basic skill areas? If so, which students are tested? All, or those with an SAT below a certain level? Which test(s) are used? Or are students identified by faculty/counselor referral?

Assuming that underprepared students were identified by some means, the institutions were asked whether guidelines exist for the placement of these students in remedial/developmental courses or programs. Does the institution have a sequence or structure of educational experiences those students should follow?

Finally, the institutions were asked whether procedures exist to evaluate remedial activities. And, if so, are these procedures institution-wide or activity specific?

The institutional responses to these questions are presented in the following pages. Where the responses were brief enough, they are presented as received. Where they were more lengthy, they have been summarized.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

University of Maryland-College Park

1. Identification of underprepared students:

UMCP reported that it identifies underprepared students through a combination of examination of the high school transcript and by SAT scores.

Beginning Fall 1984 all new freshmen (and transfer students who have not completed the equivalent of MATH 110 or a higher-numbered mathematics course) are required to take a placement test developed by the Mathematical Association of America. Exceptions are made for students with high (greater than 700) scores on the SAT mathematics test or with advanced credit from advanced placement tests. Those tested students who receive scores less than 12 (out of a possible 25) are required to take MATH 001. Prior to Fall 1984 only those students with no SAT scores or with SAT math scores below 46 were required to take MATH 001.

2. Guidelines for placement; structured activities:

All students who participate in remedial programs are regularly admitted students whose registrations will include, in addition to the remedial courses, regular credit-bearing courses applicable toward their degrees. For purposes of establishing eligibility for financial aid, the remedial courses are counted towards the students' academic loads. Grades earned in remedial courses are not included in calculation of semester or cumulative grade point averages. The remedial courses are not included in "progress toward degree" requirements of athletes as specified by NCAA.

Students in remedial courses could come from among preferred admits (although this would be improbable), regular admits, or students admitted as exceptions to standards. Since the courses are considered as preparation for credit-bearing skills courses demanded of all students (MATH 110, ENGL 101) or required in a variety of majors (CHEM 103, which is required of engineering majors; chemistry and biochemistry majors; life science majors; students in preprofessional transfer programs such as allied health, nursing, and pharmacy; etc.), many students who are not required to take the remedial courses by reason of SAT or other test scores sometimes voluntarily take the remedial courses to establish a firmer background for the credit-bearing courses.

The MATH 001 program has been in existence for many years; the ENGL 001 program began its second year in Fall 1984, and the CHEM 001 is newly initiated Fall 1984. Students in ENGL 001 will generally be admitted as exceptions to standards and will also have performed unsatisfactorily (below 70th percentile) on reading comprehension and vocabulary tests (the STEP III Tests = Sequential Tests of Educational Progress). The high school g.p.a. and SAT scores together will predict that they need special attention.

Registration in CHEM 001 is voluntary, but all students who have not satisfactorily completed MATH 110 or a higher numbered MATH course and who have a SAT mathematics score below 46 are strongly advised to take CHEM 001 before attempting CHEM 103. Since Fall 1984 will be our first offering of CHEM 001, placement in this course in future years will be influenced by the experience of 1984-1985.

In addition to these, there is a series of non-credit courses in English for admitted and non-admitted students for whom English is not the native language. These include international students and some immigrant students whose TOEFL or other test scores are so low that additional work in English as a Second Language is necessary before a student can be admitted to the University. Other students whose scores show a lesser deficiency may be admitted and will register simultaneously for credit-bearing courses for which their English proficiency is considered adequate and for less-intensive, non-credit bearing, English as a Second Language courses.

The ESL program is also budgeted under special instruction, requires special fees, and, for financial aid eligibility, is treated much like the MATH, ENGL, and CHEM courses.

3. Evaluation of remedial activities:

Evaluation at UMCP is activity specific. Satisfactory completion of the remedial course enables the student to progress to the credit-bearing or entry-level course in the same field.

University of Maryland - Baltimore County

1. Identification of underprepared students:

UMBC identifies students underprepared in mathematics and/or English via placement tests and SAT scores. All freshmen with verbal SAT's less than 500 must write an essay which is independently graded by three members of the English department. All lower level mathematics courses (through calculus) are permission only and require appropriate scores on placement tests. Students with math SAT's above 600 may be admitted to mathematics classes through precalculus without further testing. All others must score appropriately on tests developed by the Mathematical Association of America.

2. Guidelines for placement; structured activities:

Students who average D+ or less on the readings of the English essay are required to enroll in ENG 99 their first semester at UMBC.

Students who lack basic algebra skills must first enroll in MATH 99 if they wish to take any other mathematics courses. (If such a student chooses never to take a course for which there is a math prerequisite, they need never take MATH 99.) Some students taking MATH 99 may very well be upper-level. (In fact, probably 25-30% are upper level.) Other freshmen would be required to enroll in MATH 99 prior to taking any other math course, but since they have not so enrolled the campus does not consider them underprepared in relation to their curriculum objectives.

The Learning Resource Center (LRC) is a multi-purpose, multi-functional center providing a variety of academic services for students. The principal activity, at least in terms of student popularity, is the tutorial center. Staffed by honors students, the center provides tutoring in virtually all lower-level courses and a few (particularly troublesome) upper-level courses. Other LRC services include skill development workshops (in topics like GRE preparation, overcoming math anxiety, writing a research paper, etc.), programs for students who speak English as a second language, and computer-assisted instruction in writing, mathematics and study skills.

The Learning Resources Center also provides a six-week intensive "preparation for college" program for academically disadvantaged students who have been admitted to UMBC as exceptions to the University's usual admissions criteria. This past summer 43 students participated in this program.

In general, the LRC's activities are developmental rather than remedial. The students in the LRC summer program are underprepared, but the coordinators who run the program are twelve-month employees of the institution who spend part of the summer assigned to this function. Even during this period, other LRC activities, not intended for underprepared students, occur.

3. Evaluation of remedial activities:

ENG 99 and MATH 99 are evaluated on a somewhat ad hoc basis by tracking the performance of students in the subsequent courses (usually ENG 100 and MATH 103) who were required to take the remedial courses and comparing them to students who started in the college-level courses.

ENG 99 and MATH 99 students perform as well in the next course as the average freshman coming in who does not need these courses.

University of Maryland - Eastern Shore

1. Identification of underprepared students:

Underprepared students are identified in several ways: (1) initial evaluation of high school transcripts and SAT scores; students who do not meet the preferred or regular admissions criteria (as outlined in the catalog) may be admitted as underprepared individual admits; (2) testing of all incoming freshman students using the McGraw-Hill Basic Skills Tests in Reading, Math, Writing and Vocabulary; (3) referrals by individual faculty members, and (4) student self-assessment of strengths and weaknesses in the academic arena. Other tests that are employed after students have enrolled include: The Descriptive Tests of Language and Math, the Comparative Guidance Tests in English, Math and Logical Relationships, and the Learning Styles Inventory.

The University of Maryland-Eastern Shore prefers to approach the issue of remedial education from a positive perspective. The University is cognizant of the many factors that impinge upon a student's ability to perform successfully in an academic arena.

Through the work of the Office of Admissions and the Special Program staff, efforts are made to get to know the Underprepared Student in terms of his educational/family background, personal interests and abilities, etc. -- all before the student registers for the first time. This is accomplished VIA data from high school records/SAT scores, family & personal background information, Student Self-Assessment Data, interviews, telephone contacts with students and parents, university administered tests, and written recommendations. A compilation and subsequent analysis of the data will determine the extent of the remedial-related activities in which the individual student must be involved.

2. Guidelines for placement; structured activities:

In reference to #1 above, students whose SAT scores and/or grade point averages indicate underpreparedness are automatically placed in the General Curriculum/Special Services Program (formerly the Academic Development Program). (see below)

Students who are preferred or regular Admits are referred (by advisors/faculty) to the Basic Skills Center where they are to enroll in the appropriate skills classes or to receive individual tutoring by the professional staff or student tutors.

The structured remedial education activities are usually required while the student is enrolled simultaneously in credit hour courses. For example, the student designated as underprepared are limited to 12-13 credit hours per semester. At the same time, the student may be enrolled in 1-4 non-credit remedial/developmental classes.

UMES has two special programs, coordinated by the Center for Basic and Communicative Skills, to aid the underprepared student:

(a) The Special Services to Disadvantaged Students program is designed primarily to "provide" individualized instructional assistance in reading, math, writing and study skills for those students whose grades (high school and college-level) and/or SAT scores indicate a need for tutorial assistance in order that the student can perform more successfully in their college-level work. Therefore, the admittance of these students is conditional in that they are required to meet certain requirements in a satisfactory manner as determined by the program staff before they are permitted to declare a major in any other academic department as a regular student.

(b) The Instructional Assistance Center has developed a Micro-computer Skills Center whereby remedial students will be provided with instructional assistance in general basic skills (reading, writing, math and study skills) and in those basic skills as they relate to specific subject matter courses.

3. Evaluation of remedial activities:

Remedial activities are evaluated externally and internally. Since remedial education activities are federally funded, primarily, the program must meet the stated goals and objectives which are designed to meet the needs of the Underprepared Students. On an internal basis, the program staff conduct an annual evaluation which covers all aspects of the program. Thus, the evaluations are activity specific.

Remedial education is a University-Wide concern at the University of Maryland Eastern Shore. Although the primary responsibility is delegated to the special program personnel, at some point, the total faculty and staff are involved. Special workshops, newsletters and activities are planned to assist all faculty members in working effectively with the underprepared (remedial student).

BOARD OF TRUSTEES STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

The institutions governed by the Board of Trustees of State Universities and Colleges use a uniform set of procedures to identify and provide services for underprepared students. Therefore, it is possible to discuss all of these institutions as a group rather than separately. The University of Baltimore, which is an upper-division institution, accepts students in their junior year who have already demonstrated ability to do college-level work. Therefore, the University of Baltimore was excluded from this survey.

(1) Identification of underprepared students:

All entering freshmen and transfer students with fewer than 25 credit hours of college course work and who have Verbal and Math SAT scores below 470 on respective sections of the SAT Exam are given Diagnostic/Placement tests in Reading, Writing and Mathematics. Diagnostic/Placement tests used to identify underprepared students are:

1. Writing - Test of Standard Written English (TSWE)
2. Reading - Nelson-Denny Reading Test
3. Mathematics - California Achievement Test, Math Section, Level 19

(2) Guidelines for placement; structured activities:

Students who score below predetermined cut-off scores on any of the diagnostic/placement tests are required to enroll in course(s) designed to prepare students for college level work in the respective skill area(s). The students are allowed two semesters and a summer to complete the requirement. Students earn institutional credit, which is not applicable to meeting graduation requirements.

Instruction in reading, writing and mathematics is provided through a combination of classroom instruction and planned activities at the Skill Center.

(3) Evaluation of remedial activities:

The staff of the Board of Trustees of State Universities and Colleges prepare annual reports for each institution that show completion rate by subject area. Reports on retention rate, success in College, number and percent graduating, etc. are prepared periodically. The following reports are examples:

1. Fall 1982 underprepared students course completion rate.
2. Fall 1976 underprepared student success rate.
3. Fall 1976 underprepared student employment follow-up.

Follow-up studies on underprepared students who entered the system's Academic Retention Program have revealed that of the original group of students under study, 30.2% have successfully pursued their studies through the assistance of the Academic Retention Program. Of the 30.2%, 23.6% had graduated by June, 1982 and 6.6% were still enrolled. A twenty-five year national study revealed that only 37% to 40% of all higher education students graduate from the institutions of their initial enrollment.

MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Morgan State University has a dual mission as an undergraduate liberal arts college and a urban-oriented graduate institution.

1. Identification of underprepared students:

New students who are admitted as exceptions to the regular admissions policy are identified for remediation except for those students whose performance on placement tests qualify them for entrance into the regular general education program.

2. Guidelines for placement; structured activities:

Freshman profile cards are used to report freshman test results. In addition to placement in the three corrective courses, students who need work in the basic skill areas are referred to the Learning Resource Center for specialized instruction in English, Mathematics and Reading across the curriculum. Students who are required to take all three corrective courses are also directed to sign up for a special section of the freshman orientation course with an emphasis on study skills.

3. Evaluation of remedial activities:

The determination of a success rate for freshmen targeted for special courses and support services is program specific. Outcomes for students enrolled in corrective courses are monitored as follows:

English - (a) Pre-test and post-test scores
(b) Grade distribution analysis
(c) Supplemental grade reports issued by the instructor

Mathematics - (a) Pre-test and post-test scores
(b) Unit evaluations

Reading - (a) Pre-test and post-test scores
(b) Unit mastery
(c) Application of reading modules
(d) Student survey questionaire

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND

St. Mary's College is distinguished from other state colleges and universities in that its role and mission is to emphasize an undergraduate liberal arts education in a small college, primarily residential setting. Therefore, St. Mary's student body resembles that of an independent liberal arts college, rather than the other public colleges and universities.

1. Identification of underprepared students:

Since it operates under a highly selective admissions policy, St. Mary's does not intentionally admit any "underprepared" students. The College does however, use scores on the SAT's Subtest of Standard Written English, in combination with high school GPA's, to identify a small group of entering students who would benefit from a course in developmental writing prior to taking the required composition course. The "cut-off" score in this regard is adjusted upward annually to reflect the rising SAT scores of the freshman class.

Thus, given information compiled during the normal admissions process, these students were simply identified as ones who might have difficulty with the composition course. They were offered the developmental writing course as part of a larger program of academic support for all students. However, the college does not consider them to be academically underprepared as that term is used in this study.

2. Guidelines for placement; structured activities:

Remedial services at St. Mary's College include both courses and supervised peer tutoring. The small size of the college enables us to provide our students with special attention in regular classes to an extent not normally found, thus reducing the need for remedial education services. This, combined with the high SAT scores of our entering classes, has made it possible for our remedial offerings, with the exception of writing, to be totally elective. Specific courses are sometimes recommended to individual students in the advising process. The limited number of slots in the writing courses make it necessary to pre-assign most students. The available spaces are assigned to those students with the lowest SAT scores. Exceptions are occasionally made when the test of standard written English indicates unusual weakness, although the overall SAT score is above that semester's cutoff. Experience has been that this population does represent the most needy students, as indicated by class diagnostic information and the infrequent use of a provision to "test out" of this placement.

Due to class space limitations, and the placement developed to accomodate that, only a few students can voluntarily elect to take a remedial writing course at this time, and then only in the spring semester.

All other remedial courses are elective in nature. The remedial writing courses use an individualized process writing approach. The elective courses have as part of their strength the sharing of information among class members and an emphasis on the development by each student of an individual strategy or approach that is flexible enough to accommodate a variety of circumstances.

In addition, as in courses throughout the institution, some instructional use of computers is being incorporated in each remedial offering. Soon, certain skill modules will be made available to students on an "as-needed" basis in computer labs. For example, a module is now being tested that deals with improving test performance on objective tests. Also, the mathematics faculty is developing a remedial mathematics offering for students whose preparation does not allow them to succeed in college mathematics.

The College's review of students needing remedial work indicates that in most cases building security and experience/habits are as important as the development of skills. Thus, the remedial courses reflect the liberal arts orientation of St. Mary's College.

3. Evaluation of remedial activities:

The elective remedial courses (reading, vocabulary, study skills and test taking strategies) are evaluated on the basis of demonstrated proficiency in the skill area. For example, to be granted "credit," students in the reading class are expected to read at a rate and comprehension level that will enable them to handle a college reading load on a standardized measure. Therefore, the rate of student success in completing the course(s) is considered a measure of the effectiveness of the course(s).

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A chief characteristic of community colleges is their accessibility to all who have a desire for postsecondary education. Historically, community colleges have attempted to assist all students at their level of ability. Such an "open door" philosophy requires the provision of special programs and services for those who are not prepared for traditional college work. Our survey indicates that Maryland's two-year public colleges have met this challenge in a number of ways.

1. Identification of underprepared students:

Sixteen of Maryland's 17 community colleges require mandatory testing of some or all entering students. The most prevalent practice - followed by 8 colleges - is to require placement tests of all entering students seeking a degree. Four institutions require both degree and non-degree students to take placement or competency tests; while another four mandate such testing only for students whose high school record or performance on the ACT or SAT tests indicate a possible need for remediation. The one public two-year college not requiring placement tests is presently considering a report recommending that such tests be introduced.

In most instances, underprepared students could also be identified for faculty referral or by voluntary participation.

Part-time students and non-degree seeking students normally are not given competency tests. Several colleges, however, have departmental requirements that such students must pass required tests in mathematics and/or English before taking credit courses in these areas.

2. Guidelines for placement; structured activities:

There is consistency among the community colleges on their policies concerning placement in remedial programs. Fifteen of the 17 colleges place their students in remedial programs according to scores on mandatory placement tests. Whereas several colleges (4) may require participation in a comprehensive remedial program - English, reading, math, and study skills - before admission to courses creditable toward graduation, all permit students who are weak in only one or two areas to take credit courses in other areas simultaneously with their remedial courses.

Several interesting approaches to remediation are being employed. Three colleges reported the use of peers to tutor underprepared students. Several had consolidated all remedial services in one administrative unit, usually called an educational skills center or a developmental education center. Three institutions reported that they offered "pre-remedial services" to individuals lacking basic competencies necessary to take remedial courses. This service was usually referred to as Adult Basic Education. Finally, one college placed students in short courses of learning modules dealing with individual skills (such as fractions, for math).

All but 3 community colleges considered successful completion of mandatory remedial courses as adequate evidence that the student was prepared to enroll in credit-bearing freshman level courses. Three colleges went further in requiring students to also pass a competency test in their area of weakness before taking college-level courses. No colleges set a time limit on the remedial efforts of individual students.

3. Evaluation of remedial activities:

The most common form of evaluation of remedial courses and programs is the periodic study of such activities by special task forces. Ten of the 17 community colleges reported such studies. Eight institutions reported regular student evaluations of the courses just completed. Seven colleges collected evaluations by instructors of the effectiveness of remedial activities. Some colleges (5) considered the rate of successful completion by students of remedial courses to be an evaluation measure. Only 4 colleges conducted follow-up studies of students completing remedial courses to monitor their success in college-level courses and in obtaining a degree or certificate. One college had employed an external consulting firm to perform an evaluation.